

REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-69 are pending in the application; claims 1-69 stand rejected. Claims 1 and 40, 51 and 52 have been amended; claims 2-4, 24-25, 32-39, 41-42, 53-54 and 58-69 have been canceled.

In view of Terminal Disclaimers filed July 27, 2005, the provisional rejection of claims 1-67 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of co-pending Application Nos. 10/772,907 and 10/772,978 have been withdrawn. Likewise, in view of the Terminal Disclaimer filed July 27, 2005 the rejection of claims 1-67 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-5 of U.S. 6,716,953 have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections:

Claims 1-69 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over WO 00/31195 to Ohrbom et al. ("Ohrbom") as set forth in paragraph 7 of the Office Action dated May 11, 2005. The Examiner states that Applicants' arguments filed July 27, 2005 have been fully considered but were found not to be persuasive. The Examiner states that as Applicants' amendments necessitated the new grounds for rejection, the Action was made final. Applicants traverse this rejection and file herewith a Request for Continued Examination.

Independent claims 1 and 40 have now been amended to recite a copolymer comprised of a donor monomer selected from isobutylene, diisobutylene, dipentene, and/or isoprenol. This was the subject matter recited in claims 68 and 69 which were newly added by way of the amendment dated July 27, 2005. These olefinic monomers are neither mentioned nor suggested in the teachings of Ohrbom. Further, Applicants assert that Ohrbom neither teaches nor suggests a reaction product formed from, *inter alia*, a copolymer comprising at least 30 mol% of residues of specified alternating structural units formed from these specific donor monomers. In fact, the reference is devoid of any mention of alternating copolymers, or copolymers having alternating structural units, at all; nor would such a copolymer


having such alternating structural units be necessarily inherent in the copolymers of Ohrbom. Since Ohrbom does not disclose or suggest the specific olefinic monomers

required by the claims as amended there would have been no motivation found in Ohrbom to prepare the alternating copolymers of Applicants' claims as amended using the olefinic monomers isobutylene, diisobutylene, dipentene, and/or isoprenol. While Ohrbom discloses an acrylic resin and its preparation, there are only provided therein long lists of possible functional group-containing ethylenically unsaturated monomers to be reacted with one or more other ethylenically unsaturated monomers, examples of which are likewise provided in an exhaustive list. Neither exhaustive list contains or suggests isobutylene, diisobutylene, dipentene, and/or isoprenol.

Moreover, Ohrbom neither discloses nor appreciates the use of the acceptor/donor monomer concept (as is required by the present application) to form alternating copolymers or copolymers having a percentage of alternating structural units derived from isobutylene, diisobutylene, dipentene, and/or isoprenol.

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 USC 102 and/or 103 are respectfully requested. Applicants believe that this application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner deems there to be any issues remaining, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney in order to expedite resolution of such matters.

Respectfully Submitted,


Deborah M. Altman
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 42,259

PPG Industries, Inc.
One PPG Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15272
Telephone: (412) 434-2922
Facsimile: (412) 434-4292

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
October 26, 2005